

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,500	01/29/2004	Timothy Culver	09710-1216	5521
7590 10/05/2007 WORLDCOM, INC.				INER
TECHNOLOGY LAW DEPARTMENT			MARCELO, MELVIN C	
1133 19TH STI WASHINGTO	-		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

*				W
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	.•
÷		10/767,500	CULVER, TIMOTHY	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Melvin Marcelo	2616	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apported to the communication apport.	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.	PATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI e, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 J	lanuary 2004.		
		s action is non-final.		
3)[	Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits i	s
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposit	ion of Claims			
4)🖂	Claim(s) 27-65 is/are pending in the application	on.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
5)🖂	Claim(s) 41-45 and 51-58 is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>27-31,34-40,46-50 and 59-65</u> is/are	rejected.		
7)⊠	Claim(s) 32 and 33 is/are objected to.			
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Applicat	ion Papers			
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2004 is/are	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ o	objected to by the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(	d).
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority :	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
	1. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documen		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	· ·	received in this National Stage	
	application from the International Burea	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
* (	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies no	received.	
Attachmer		A) 🗆 1-4 1	Summing (DTO 442)	
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
3) X Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5)	Informal Patent Application	

Application/Control Number: 10/767,500

Art Unit: 2616

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Double Patenting**

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 27-31 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1/5, 2-4 and 6, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 6,690,663 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented apparatus claims obviously implements a process corresponding to the application method claims in order to perform the apparatus's recited functions.

Art Unit: 2616

With respect to storing the message in the data storage system if the voice call initiated by the calling party is not accepted, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the voice mail functionality for unanswered calls in the claimed IP network since voice mail functionality for unanswered calls in the PSTN system is well known and would have been an expected functionality for telephony services, whether over a PSTN or IP, for calling and called parties.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 5. Claims 34-40, 46-50 and 59-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The original disclosure describes an "internet telephony server for providing internet telephony functionality through a web site" (108 in Figure 1). New claims 34-40, 46-50 and 59-65 recite a "web server," which cannot be found in the original disclosure. The scope of "web server" cannot be determined from the original disclosure and thus constitutes new matter.

## Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 32 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/767,500

Art Unit: 2616

7. Claims 41-45 and 51-58 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melvin Marcelo whose telephone number is 571-272-3125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Melvin Marcelo Primary Examiner Art Unit 2616 Page 4

October 1, 2007